

ritory and thus succeeded in separating the Austrian forces.

London, Dec. 28.—According to the Russian reports, the German attempts to capture Warsaw have failed, while the Berlin official statement says that there is general confidence that the German and Austro-Hungarian forces are making progress along the great front.

Situation in Poland Now

Promising, Berlin Reports.

Berlin (by wireless to Saville, N. Y.), Dec. 28.—The Official Press Bureau gave out the following to-day:

"Chief interest continues centered in Poland, where the position of the German and Austro-Hungarian forces are making progress along the great front. There is a feeling here that important developments are probable in Poland within a few days. While the outlook in the East and Russian section is satisfactory, it is believed the most promising point is southwest of Tomaszow.

"A dispatch from Warsaw says Polish revolutionaries have blown up their ammunition depot in the city, to the memory of Poles loyal to Russia."

The German army headquarters staff issued the following statement to-day: "There is no news from East Prussia. From Poland, North of the Vistula and the left bank of the Vistula our attacks are developing, notwithstanding the very unfavorable weather."

SUBMARINE THREAT FLOUTED BY BRITISH

Say Germany Is Conducting "Reckless War on Commerce" Already.

(By Cable to The Tribune.)

London, Dec. 28.—Admiral Schlieper's article in the "Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger" advocating "a systematic and reckless war of retaliation against British commerce" by means of submarines, is attracting attention here, especially in naval circles, where it excites much contemptuous comment. German commanders, say British naval experts, are in no need of Schlieper's advice, since they have already put it in practice, in proof of which they instance the cases of the British ship Gluxtra and the French ship Admiral Ganteaume, both merchant vessels, sunk by German submarines, the latter when carrying hundreds of Belgian refugees.

"The British navy," says the correspondent, discussing the Schlieper article, says: "It is not necessary to take very serious notice of that officer's lucubrations. The true reason for them is that he advocates has already been put into practice. Moreover, it is probable that the German submarine flotilla has been able to extend the said practice. They would have done so already. The total number of German submarines is between twenty-five and thirty, so far as is known, and assuming that new submarines have replaced those lost during the war, the submarine range of action is not wide enough to interfere with the deep sea trade routes. It does not follow, however, that the warning should be ignored. The danger of dealing with submarines is to patrol the water in which they voyage with light and swift armed craft. An obvious suggestion is that all merchant ships should be armed with light guns."

"What is perhaps the most instructive aspect of the German demand for open, practical methods of warfare is that at the present stage of the war a German official should have nothing better to urge than a submarine attack upon merchant shipping."

(By Cable to The Tribune.)

Copenhagen, Dec. 28.—The "Hanniburger Fremdeblatt" says that four British airmen who dropped bombs on Langoey, a German island in the North Sea, on Christmas, killed several and wounded others. The article adds that Langoey is uninhabited. From investigations made here it is said that it was not British airmen who dropped the bombs, but pursuing German airmen, who believed British torpedo craft were lurking in the fog off the island.

TURKS IMPRISON BRITISH OFFICIAL

Threat to Send U. S. Cruiser North Carolina Enough to Effect His Release.

(By Cable to The Tribune.)

London, Dec. 28.—The Daily Chronicle's correspondent writes from Cairo: "An extraordinary incident is reported from Saida. The authorities there put a guard around the house of the British vice-consul and refused to let him to leave it. The guard was instructed to fire on any one coming from the building. The United States consul general at Beyrout heard of the matter and requested the Vail to withdraw the guard and liberate the British vice-consul. The Vail replied by saying that the matter was for the military authorities. Thereupon the American representative sent a message to the Vail saying: 'It and remains for me to send the North Carolina to Saida. The commander of that vessel will have orders to force his way into the house and the vice-consul will leave under the protection of the American flag.' In the face of this threat the Turkish authorities yielded and the vice-consul was permitted to leave his house and quit Saida by ship."

PARIS DISCUSSES JAPAN'S ATTITUDE

Clemenceau Agrees with Pichon That Mikado Should Send Troops to Europe.

(By Cable to The Tribune.)

Paris, Dec. 28.—The question of the armed intervention of Japan in the western theatre of the war in Europe has spread from the polemists to the public. It has been quite a Christmas subject for debate in the cafes. Clemenceau's powerful influence is clearly on the side of Stephen Pichon, in favor of their employment. In consequence of the length of time the execution of such an enterprise would involve, it appears to M. Pichon absolutely necessary to examine, in conjunction with the governments in London and Tokyo, under what conditions the intervention in Europe of Britain's ally could be realized.

The American note, mentioning that foodstuffs are conditional contraband, since they may be destined for the use of a civil population, as well as for the use of the army, is in entire agreement with the doctrine expressed by Lord Salisbury, British Foreign Secretary, in his correspondence with the Washington government concerning the shipment of foodstuffs to the Transvaal during the Boer war in South Africa. Lord Salisbury wrote then:

"Foodstuffs with a hostile destination should be considered contraband of war only if they are supplied for the enemy's forces. It is not sufficient that they are capable of being so used; it must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of seizure."

This is perhaps the most far-reaching declaration of the American note, since if it is accepted by Great Britain, American trade with Germany and Austria, virtually at a standstill now, would be resumed, affecting the prices of wheat, flour, livestock and the variety of products which go to make up "foodstuffs."

Taking up the subject of detention of American ships at sea, the Washington government states that it cannot tolerate undue delays in examining the papers of the crews of such ships to British ports for detailed examination. It argues that proof of hostile destination of the cargo must be in evidence in the time of the seizure. The note adds, is fully recognized, but it cannot be extended to the point of diverting American ships into belligerent ports merely on suspicion.

The U. S. States asserts, moreover, that it views with growing concern the detention of scores of American cargoes consigned from this country to neutral ports, contending that it should be the duty of the belligerent to protect neutral commerce and prevent innocent merchants from suffering.

Complaints of Discrimination.

One of the most conspicuous complaints cited in the note is against the treatment by Great Britain of American cargoes of copper. It is not according to the same treatment to American trade in copper with the Scandinavian countries as to commerce in this product between the United States and Italy under the same conditions of shipment. Even though the Italian government has proclaimed an embargo on the exportation of copper from Italy to belligerent countries, similar to the one which the American government further records its position on consignments shipped "to order" or no specific consignee, stating that this circumstance alone is not sufficient to render the American cargoes and is of itself not suspicious. This view has been expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States, but Great Britain announced recently that cargoes shipped "to order" would be considered "suspect."

To-day's note points out that to hold consignments marked "to order" proof must be presented at the time of seizure that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination, or, if a sufficient number of other facts must be advanced to justify further examination of the cargo. It is in this connection that the United States remarks that commerce between neutral nations constitutes the normal relations of peace and not war, and that the assumption of the belligerent that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination is not a sufficient basis for seizure.

Other Neutrals May Act.

Although the sending of the note was not known to members of the diplomatic corps to-night, and it is unlikely that the Washington government, with the exception of the British Ambassador, will communicate it to them unless they request it, high officials thought it not unlikely that the path marked by the United States would be followed by other neutral governments, and that the American, especially have been keeping in close touch with the attitude of the United States on subjects of neutrality, and in most cases have adhered to the American position. The note, however, involves commerce mostly with European neutrals, it is believed that diplomatic representatives here of the latter will seek to learn the American viewpoint for transmission to their governments.

The position of the United States as expressed in to-day's note is a consequence of several steps by Great Britain, France and Germany in the direction of a more aggressive policy. The Declaration of London, drafted in 1909, embodying the previous understandings of international law and new rules for the conduct of maritime warfare with respect to neutral commerce, had not been ratified when the present war broke out, it was thought for a time all countries would adhere to it. Great Britain, by an order in council on October 20, last, declared that the Declaration of London effective with certain modifications. Germany announced to all neutrals her willingness to adhere to the whole declaration if the other belligerents would do the same. The United States took the position that it could not accept piecemeal adoption by the Allies of the Declaration of London with their own amendments, and declared that it would be guided by the general principles of international law, irrespective of the Declaration of London. The German government, in a formal note to the United States and other neutrals, announced that it would accept the British modifications, which similarly the United States opposed.

To-day's note follows in many important points the argument then advanced by the British press, and in particular with respect to neutral commerce was a distinct departure from many previously accepted principles of international law.

Fact, it is decided upon in the air. Up to three months ago it was the same quiet, even sleepy, village that Hank Hudson discovered just before he fell into the river. But things started to happen.

In the happy days, three months ago, there was only one little ferry. It was the Rockland, Captain Lyons commanding, and it ferried between Nyack and Tarrytown, some three miles apart. Having a monopoly of the business, the Rockland charged pedestrians 15 cents each and automobilists a quarter to get to the other side.

When he cut prices to 10 cents Nyack sat up and took notice. When the Rockland met his price of 10 cents Captain Wilkes merely smiled and chopped off another nickel.

The Flushing used to glide out of its slip just as the Rockland came to its pier at the same instant. Just about the time the two captains were thinking of giving trading stamps, they learned that the boatmen of the Tarrytown's best known citizens and decided to consolidate.

It was agreed that the Rockland should leave Tarrytown just as the Flushing left Nyack, and vice versa. It was not a loose partnership, because there was no division of earnings. But prices went back to normal, and Nyack was content again.

Three weeks ago—oh, fateful day!—the Rockland cast off thirty minutes ahead of the prearranged time. Did Captain Wilkes untie the Flushing and start for Tarrytown? No. He did. He started so rapidly that he was unable to stop when he reached there and crashed squarely into the Rockland.

With full steam up he then proceeded to push the Rockland just two and one-half miles down stream, the while eighty-year-old Captain Lyons stood on the bridge and gesticulated freely. The passengers meanwhile were having a time of their own.

When Captain Wilkes withdrew the nose of his boat and started up the river Captain Lyons started right after him. Perhaps he was not angry, but it is on record that he chased the Flushing around the Hudson River for one hour and a half. Then, by mutual consent, there was a halt.

When the passengers carried the news back to Nyack there was a riot, to put it mildly. And the riot was not abated a bit when the United States steamboat inspectors two weeks ago held a secret meeting to decide whether they should take away the Rockland's license or that of the Flushing. Captain Wilkes told the inspectors the ramming was an accident. Captain Lyons told them it wasn't.

There must have been something scandalous at the hearing, says Nyack, because the stenographer was forced to transcribe her notes in the presence of the inspectors, and then to tear them up.

This morning in the office of Supreme Judge Tompkins, in Nyack, there will be another secret session. Anything may happen, and perhaps Nyack isn't curious to know? Curious? It's palpitating!

James Kiny, president of Nyack, said over the telephone last night that the Rockland belongs to the North River Steamboat Company and the Flushing to the North River Ferry Company.

must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of seizure."

This is perhaps the most far-reaching declaration of the American note, since if it is accepted by Great Britain, American trade with Germany and Austria, virtually at a standstill now, would be resumed, affecting the prices of wheat, flour, livestock and the variety of products which go to make up "foodstuffs."

Taking up the subject of detention of American ships at sea, the Washington government states that it cannot tolerate undue delays in examining the papers of the crews of such ships to British ports for detailed examination. It argues that proof of hostile destination of the cargo must be in evidence in the time of the seizure. The note adds, is fully recognized, but it cannot be extended to the point of diverting American ships into belligerent ports merely on suspicion.

The U. S. States asserts, moreover, that it views with growing concern the detention of scores of American cargoes consigned from this country to neutral ports, contending that it should be the duty of the belligerent to protect neutral commerce and prevent innocent merchants from suffering.

Complaints of Discrimination.

One of the most conspicuous complaints cited in the note is against the treatment by Great Britain of American cargoes of copper. It is not according to the same treatment to American trade in copper with the Scandinavian countries as to commerce in this product between the United States and Italy under the same conditions of shipment. Even though the Italian government has proclaimed an embargo on the exportation of copper from Italy to belligerent countries, similar to the one which the American government further records its position on consignments shipped "to order" or no specific consignee, stating that this circumstance alone is not sufficient to render the American cargoes and is of itself not suspicious. This view has been expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States, but Great Britain announced recently that cargoes shipped "to order" would be considered "suspect."

To-day's note points out that to hold consignments marked "to order" proof must be presented at the time of seizure that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination, or, if a sufficient number of other facts must be advanced to justify further examination of the cargo. It is in this connection that the United States remarks that commerce between neutral nations constitutes the normal relations of peace and not war, and that the assumption of the belligerent that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination is not a sufficient basis for seizure.

Other Neutrals May Act.

Although the sending of the note was not known to members of the diplomatic corps to-night, and it is unlikely that the Washington government, with the exception of the British Ambassador, will communicate it to them unless they request it, high officials thought it not unlikely that the path marked by the United States would be followed by other neutral governments, and that the American, especially have been keeping in close touch with the attitude of the United States on subjects of neutrality, and in most cases have adhered to the American position. The note, however, involves commerce mostly with European neutrals, it is believed that diplomatic representatives here of the latter will seek to learn the American viewpoint for transmission to their governments.

The position of the United States as expressed in to-day's note is a consequence of several steps by Great Britain, France and Germany in the direction of a more aggressive policy. The Declaration of London, drafted in 1909, embodying the previous understandings of international law and new rules for the conduct of maritime warfare with respect to neutral commerce, had not been ratified when the present war broke out, it was thought for a time all countries would adhere to it. Great Britain, by an order in council on October 20, last, declared that the Declaration of London effective with certain modifications. Germany announced to all neutrals her willingness to adhere to the whole declaration if the other belligerents would do the same. The United States took the position that it could not accept piecemeal adoption by the Allies of the Declaration of London with their own amendments, and declared that it would be guided by the general principles of international law, irrespective of the Declaration of London. The German government, in a formal note to the United States and other neutrals, announced that it would accept the British modifications, which similarly the United States opposed.

To-day's note follows in many important points the argument then advanced by the British press, and in particular with respect to neutral commerce was a distinct departure from many previously accepted principles of international law.

Fact, it is decided upon in the air. Up to three months ago it was the same quiet, even sleepy, village that Hank Hudson discovered just before he fell into the river. But things started to happen.

In the happy days, three months ago, there was only one little ferry. It was the Rockland, Captain Lyons commanding, and it ferried between Nyack and Tarrytown, some three miles apart. Having a monopoly of the business, the Rockland charged pedestrians 15 cents each and automobilists a quarter to get to the other side.

When he cut prices to 10 cents Nyack sat up and took notice. When the Rockland met his price of 10 cents Captain Wilkes merely smiled and chopped off another nickel.

The Flushing used to glide out of its slip just as the Rockland came to its pier at the same instant. Just about the time the two captains were thinking of giving trading stamps, they learned that the boatmen of the Tarrytown's best known citizens and decided to consolidate.

It was agreed that the Rockland should leave Tarrytown just as the Flushing left Nyack, and vice versa. It was not a loose partnership, because there was no division of earnings. But prices went back to normal, and Nyack was content again.

Three weeks ago—oh, fateful day!—the Rockland cast off thirty minutes ahead of the prearranged time. Did Captain Wilkes untie the Flushing and start for Tarrytown? No. He did. He started so rapidly that he was unable to stop when he reached there and crashed squarely into the Rockland.

With full steam up he then proceeded to push the Rockland just two and one-half miles down stream, the while eighty-year-old Captain Lyons stood on the bridge and gesticulated freely. The passengers meanwhile were having a time of their own.

When Captain Wilkes withdrew the nose of his boat and started up the river Captain Lyons started right after him. Perhaps he was not angry, but it is on record that he chased the Flushing around the Hudson River for one hour and a half. Then, by mutual consent, there was a halt.

When the passengers carried the news back to Nyack there was a riot, to put it mildly. And the riot was not abated a bit when the United States steamboat inspectors two weeks ago held a secret meeting to decide whether they should take away the Rockland's license or that of the Flushing. Captain Wilkes told the inspectors the ramming was an accident. Captain Lyons told them it wasn't.

There must have been something scandalous at the hearing, says Nyack, because the stenographer was forced to transcribe her notes in the presence of the inspectors, and then to tear them up.

This morning in the office of Supreme Judge Tompkins, in Nyack, there will be another secret session. Anything may happen, and perhaps Nyack isn't curious to know? Curious? It's palpitating!

James Kiny, president of Nyack, said over the telephone last night that the Rockland belongs to the North River Steamboat Company and the Flushing to the North River Ferry Company.

must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of seizure."

This is perhaps the most far-reaching declaration of the American note, since if it is accepted by Great Britain, American trade with Germany and Austria, virtually at a standstill now, would be resumed, affecting the prices of wheat, flour, livestock and the variety of products which go to make up "foodstuffs."

Taking up the subject of detention of American ships at sea, the Washington government states that it cannot tolerate undue delays in examining the papers of the crews of such ships to British ports for detailed examination. It argues that proof of hostile destination of the cargo must be in evidence in the time of the seizure. The note adds, is fully recognized, but it cannot be extended to the point of diverting American ships into belligerent ports merely on suspicion.

The U. S. States asserts, moreover, that it views with growing concern the detention of scores of American cargoes consigned from this country to neutral ports, contending that it should be the duty of the belligerent to protect neutral commerce and prevent innocent merchants from suffering.

Complaints of Discrimination.

One of the most conspicuous complaints cited in the note is against the treatment by Great Britain of American cargoes of copper. It is not according to the same treatment to American trade in copper with the Scandinavian countries as to commerce in this product between the United States and Italy under the same conditions of shipment. Even though the Italian government has proclaimed an embargo on the exportation of copper from Italy to belligerent countries, similar to the one which the American government further records its position on consignments shipped "to order" or no specific consignee, stating that this circumstance alone is not sufficient to render the American cargoes and is of itself not suspicious. This view has been expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States, but Great Britain announced recently that cargoes shipped "to order" would be considered "suspect."

To-day's note points out that to hold consignments marked "to order" proof must be presented at the time of seizure that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination, or, if a sufficient number of other facts must be advanced to justify further examination of the cargo. It is in this connection that the United States remarks that commerce between neutral nations constitutes the normal relations of peace and not war, and that the assumption of the belligerent that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination is not a sufficient basis for seizure.

Other Neutrals May Act.

Although the sending of the note was not known to members of the diplomatic corps to-night, and it is unlikely that the Washington government, with the exception of the British Ambassador, will communicate it to them unless they request it, high officials thought it not unlikely that the path marked by the United States would be followed by other neutral governments, and that the American, especially have been keeping in close touch with the attitude of the United States on subjects of neutrality, and in most cases have adhered to the American position. The note, however, involves commerce mostly with European neutrals, it is believed that diplomatic representatives here of the latter will seek to learn the American viewpoint for transmission to their governments.

The position of the United States as expressed in to-day's note is a consequence of several steps by Great Britain, France and Germany in the direction of a more aggressive policy. The Declaration of London, drafted in 1909, embodying the previous understandings of international law and new rules for the conduct of maritime warfare with respect to neutral commerce, had not been ratified when the present war broke out, it was thought for a time all countries would adhere to it. Great Britain, by an order in council on October 20, last, declared that the Declaration of London effective with certain modifications. Germany announced to all neutrals her willingness to adhere to the whole declaration if the other belligerents would do the same. The United States took the position that it could not accept piecemeal adoption by the Allies of the Declaration of London with their own amendments, and declared that it would be guided by the general principles of international law, irrespective of the Declaration of London. The German government, in a formal note to the United States and other neutrals, announced that it would accept the British modifications, which similarly the United States opposed.

To-day's note follows in many important points the argument then advanced by the British press, and in particular with respect to neutral commerce was a distinct departure from many previously accepted principles of international law.

Fact, it is decided upon in the air. Up to three months ago it was the same quiet, even sleepy, village that Hank Hudson discovered just before he fell into the river. But things started to happen.

In the happy days, three months ago, there was only one little ferry. It was the Rockland, Captain Lyons commanding, and it ferried between Nyack and Tarrytown, some three miles apart. Having a monopoly of the business, the Rockland charged pedestrians 15 cents each and automobilists a quarter to get to the other side.

When he cut prices to 10 cents Nyack sat up and took notice. When the Rockland met his price of 10 cents Captain Wilkes merely smiled and chopped off another nickel.

The Flushing used to glide out of its slip just as the Rockland came to its pier at the same instant. Just about the time the two captains were thinking of giving trading stamps, they learned that the boatmen of the Tarrytown's best known citizens and decided to consolidate.

It was agreed that the Rockland should leave Tarrytown just as the Flushing left Nyack, and vice versa. It was not a loose partnership, because there was no division of earnings. But prices went back to normal, and Nyack was content again.

Three weeks ago—oh, fateful day!—the Rockland cast off thirty minutes ahead of the prearranged time. Did Captain Wilkes untie the Flushing and start for Tarrytown? No. He did. He started so rapidly that he was unable to stop when he reached there and crashed squarely into the Rockland.

With full steam up he then proceeded to push the Rockland just two and one-half miles down stream, the while eighty-year-old Captain Lyons stood on the bridge and gesticulated freely. The passengers meanwhile were having a time of their own.

When Captain Wilkes withdrew the nose of his boat and started up the river Captain Lyons started right after him. Perhaps he was not angry, but it is on record that he chased the Flushing around the Hudson River for one hour and a half. Then, by mutual consent, there was a halt.

When the passengers carried the news back to Nyack there was a riot, to put it mildly. And the riot was not abated a bit when the United States steamboat inspectors two weeks ago held a secret meeting to decide whether they should take away the Rockland's license or that of the Flushing. Captain Wilkes told the inspectors the ramming was an accident. Captain Lyons told them it wasn't.

There must have been something scandalous at the hearing, says Nyack, because the stenographer was forced to transcribe her notes in the presence of the inspectors, and then to tear them up.

This morning in the office of Supreme Judge Tompkins, in Nyack, there will be another secret session. Anything may happen, and perhaps Nyack isn't curious to know? Curious? It's palpitating!

James Kiny, president of Nyack, said over the telephone last night that the Rockland belongs to the North River Steamboat Company and the Flushing to the North River Ferry Company.

must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of seizure."

This is perhaps the most far-reaching declaration of the American note, since if it is accepted by Great Britain, American trade with Germany and Austria, virtually at a standstill now, would be resumed, affecting the prices of wheat, flour, livestock and the variety of products which go to make up "foodstuffs."

Taking up the subject of detention of American ships at sea, the Washington government states that it cannot tolerate undue delays in examining the papers of the crews of such ships to British ports for detailed examination. It argues that proof of hostile destination of the cargo must be in evidence in the time of the seizure. The note adds, is fully recognized, but it cannot be extended to the point of diverting American ships into belligerent ports merely on suspicion.

The U. S. States asserts, moreover, that it views with growing concern the detention of scores of American cargoes consigned from this country to neutral ports, contending that it should be the duty of the belligerent to protect neutral commerce and prevent innocent merchants from suffering.

Complaints of Discrimination.

One of the most conspicuous complaints cited in the note is against the treatment by Great Britain of American cargoes of copper. It is not according to the same treatment to American trade in copper with the Scandinavian countries as to commerce in this product between the United States and Italy under the same conditions of shipment. Even though the Italian government has proclaimed an embargo on the exportation of copper from Italy to belligerent countries, similar to the one which the American government further records its position on consignments shipped "to order" or no specific consignee, stating that this circumstance alone is not sufficient to render the American cargoes and is of itself not suspicious. This view has been expressed by the Supreme Court of the United States, but Great Britain announced recently that cargoes shipped "to order" would be considered "suspect."

To-day's note points out that to hold consignments marked "to order" proof must be presented at the time of seizure that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination, or, if a sufficient number of other facts must be advanced to justify further examination of the cargo. It is in this connection that the United States remarks that commerce between neutral nations constitutes the normal relations of peace and not war, and that the assumption of the belligerent that the cargo is intended for a hostile destination is not a sufficient basis for seizure.

Other Neutrals May Act.

Although the sending of the note was not known to members of the diplomatic corps to-night, and it is unlikely that the Washington government, with the exception of the British Ambassador, will communicate it to them unless they request it, high officials thought it not unlikely that the path marked by the United States would be followed by other neutral governments, and that the American, especially have been keeping in close touch with the attitude of the United States on subjects of neutrality, and in most cases have adhered to the American position. The note, however, involves commerce mostly with European neutrals, it is believed that diplomatic representatives here of the latter will seek to learn the American viewpoint for transmission to their governments.

The position of the United States as expressed in to-day's note is a consequence of several steps by Great Britain, France and Germany in the direction of a more aggressive policy. The Declaration of London, drafted in 1909, embodying the previous understandings of international law and new rules for the conduct of maritime warfare with respect to neutral commerce, had not been ratified when the present war broke out, it was thought for a time all countries would adhere to it. Great Britain, by an order in council on October 20, last, declared that the Declaration of London effective with certain modifications. Germany announced to all neutrals her willingness to adhere to the whole declaration if the other belligerents would do the same. The United States took the position that it could not accept piecemeal adoption by the Allies of the Declaration of London with their own amendments, and declared that it would be guided by the general principles of international law, irrespective of the Declaration of London. The German government, in a formal note to the United States and other neutrals, announced that it would accept the British modifications, which similarly the United States opposed.

To-day's note follows in many important points the argument then advanced by the British press, and in particular with respect to neutral commerce was a distinct departure from many previously accepted principles of international law.

Fact, it is decided upon in the air. Up to three months ago it was the same quiet, even sleepy, village that Hank Hudson discovered just before he fell into the river. But things started to happen.

In the happy days, three months ago, there was only one little ferry. It was the Rockland, Captain Lyons commanding, and it ferried between Nyack and Tarrytown, some three miles apart. Having a monopoly of the business, the Rockland charged pedestrians 15 cents each and automobilists a quarter to get to the other side.

When he cut prices to 10 cents Nyack sat up and took notice. When the Rockland met his price of 10 cents Captain Wilkes merely smiled and chopped off another nickel.

The Flushing used to glide out of its slip just as the Rockland came to its pier at the same instant. Just about the time the two captains were thinking of giving trading stamps, they learned that the boatmen of the Tarrytown's best known citizens and decided to consolidate.

It was agreed that the Rockland should leave Tarrytown just as the Flushing left Nyack, and vice versa. It was not a loose partnership, because there was no division of earnings. But prices went back to normal, and Nyack was content again.

Three weeks ago—oh, fateful day!—the Rockland cast off thirty minutes ahead of the prearranged time. Did Captain Wilkes untie the Flushing and start for Tarrytown? No. He did. He started so rapidly that he was unable to stop when he reached there and crashed squarely into the Rockland.

With full steam up he then proceeded to push the Rockland just two and one-half miles down stream, the while eighty-year-old Captain Lyons stood on the bridge and gesticulated freely. The passengers meanwhile were having a time of their own.

When Captain Wilkes withdrew the nose of his boat and started up the river Captain Lyons started right after him. Perhaps he was not angry, but it is on record that he chased the Flushing around the Hudson River for one hour and a half. Then, by mutual consent, there was a halt.

When the passengers carried the news back to Nyack there was a riot, to put it mildly. And the riot was not abated a bit when the United States steamboat inspectors two weeks ago held a secret meeting to decide whether they should take away the Rockland's license or that of the Flushing. Captain Wilkes told the inspectors the ramming was an accident. Captain Lyons told them it wasn't.

There must have been something scandalous at the hearing, says Nyack, because the stenographer was forced to transcribe her notes in the presence of the inspectors, and then to tear them up.

This morning in the office of Supreme Judge Tompkins, in Nyack, there will be another secret session. Anything may happen, and perhaps Nyack isn't curious to know? Curious? It's palpitating!

James Kiny, president of Nyack, said over the telephone last night that the Rockland belongs to the North River Steamboat Company and the Flushing to the North River Ferry Company.

must be shown that this was in fact their destination at the time of seizure."

This is perhaps the most far-reaching declaration of the American note, since if it is accepted by Great Britain, American trade with Germany and Austria, virtually at a standstill now, would be resumed, affecting the prices of wheat, flour, livestock and the variety of products which go to make up "foodstuffs."

Taking up the subject of detention of American ships at sea, the Washington government states that it cannot tolerate undue delays in examining the papers of the crews of such ships to British ports for detailed examination. It argues that proof of hostile destination of the cargo must be in evidence in the time of the seizure. The note adds, is fully recognized, but it cannot be extended to the point of diverting American ships into belligerent ports merely on suspicion.

The U. S. States asserts, moreover, that it views with growing concern the detention of scores of American cargoes consigned from this country to neutral ports, contending that it should be the duty of the belligerent to protect neutral commerce and prevent innocent merchants from suffering.

Complaints of Discrimination.

One of the most conspicuous complaints cited in the note is against the treatment by Great Britain of American cargoes of copper. It is not according to the same treatment to American trade in copper with the Scandinavian countries as to commerce in this product between the United